423 [245] [428] It is customary for a man to plant a few trees on his own land for his sister's children for their later use. Women sometimes acquire trees of their own in this way but unless a woman is the sole surviving member of the agnatic group in which are vested the rights to the land carrying economic trees which she uses, she acquires no rights to specific trees from her father. After marriage she has only limited access to her patrikin's trees whose produce she previously shared. One householder stated that he would not expect his sister to ask for produce from his [685] trees because her husband should have enough of his own. Another once lodged a formal complaint with the Department of District Administration staff against his sister's husband who had come from another village to harvest one of his trees without first seeking his permission.

These restrictions do not apply to a widow who has returned to the village as a dependent on her father's kin; nor do they apply to a married woman if the trees in question were planted by her husband while gardening on the land of her group.

428 Economic trees are ideally inherited patrilineally in the same way as the land of the planter (see p.38).[A] Sometimes a man inherits trees from his father, usually in an area some distance from where he lives, without retaining proprietary rights to his father's land where the trees stand. The heir then needs to seek permission for access to the trees which he may have been allowed to retain by the deceased's co-resident kin who inherited the [423] land. On the other hand, an individual may receive as a gift (from a distantly related kinsman) continuous rights to trees on land which he knows will be inherited by the donor's patrilineal descendants. In each of these ways rights to trees are transmitted from the planter to another person who does not receive the planter's land.

We noted one case where an individual seems to have reinforced a claim to inherit particular parcels of the land which he hoped he would share with another heir, by planting permanent trees there while gardening. The trees bore witness to the fact that these particular gardening areas had long been identified with him.

425 A man may periodically visit a distant area where he claims proprietary rights to land which he has not gardened for some time and harvest tree crops, or perhaps hunt there, and thereby reassert his claim to the land, but this mechanism is doubtless inadequate unless a close kinsman permanently resident there is willing to represent his interests at other times.

423 614 On special festive occasions a localized patrilineal group has some call on the produce of the trees or even of garden produce of residents of other villages who are either closely related

A. [See Category 428, p. 38--Analyst]

628 together, the church council, with representatives from all the
631 villages, deliberated together. This cooperation was a gradual
development occurring over the years under consideration; it will
731 be traced in detail in a later chapter. The setting up of wards
under the Higaturu Local Government Council led to further occasions
[794] for formal cooperation between villages belonging to the same ward.
It was characteristic of both the church and the government council
[797] organizations that they divided the Sasembata district into areas
with definite boundaries, each area comprising several villages.
The church recognized two such divisions, the government council
three. I have already emphasized that the idea of such boundaries
[192] was a novel one (see Map IX).[A] It is beginning to have two kinds
of effect: first, the strengthening of bonds between villages
within the same ward or the same section of a mission parish
(e.g., bonds between Sivepe and Isoge, which up to now have not
been closely allied) and secondly, the loosening of bonds between
villages divided by the boundaries which are now being defined
(e.g., bonds between Sivepe and Kongohambo, hitherto closely allied,
but now separated by administrative procedures).

These generalizations will be documented below; my task at
628 present is to consider contacts between Sivepe and closely allied
423 villages arising out of the eruption and relocation. Here inter-
village cooperation was a far less significant factor than inter-
578 village competition, especially for use of the land. One of the
deep anxieties of the Orokaiva in the refugee camps and later in
resettlement villages such as Irihambo, Awala, Kongohambo was that
if the people did not return to their land, some others might
decide to occupy it and it might be impossible to dislodge them.
This was a very real danger because neither in 1951 nor at present
is there in existence a land register from which the ownership of
individual or village parcels may be unequivocally established.
The Orokaiva plant boundary trees round their blocks of land and
● [685] there is a taboo on interfering with these. This is not merely a
supernatural taboo; interference with a boundary justifies a
killing. It is far less clear, however, just what rights a person
holds in a particular parcel. As this is a crucial issue in the
whole history of Orokaiva resettlement, I should explain this in
some detail.

Crocombe and Hogbin provide an excellent example of the
423 ambiguity of Orokaiva land rights. After wars with the Sangara,
613 both the Andiriha and the Tandai'undi clans were driven from their
villages and settled down together in a village named Sambogo.
[621] Later, some of the Andiriha set up Inonda on land to which the
Tandai'undi had superior rights. At present, this land is used by
Andiriha, and upon inquiring into the legal basis of tenure I was
given the following explanation. Two daughters of the Tandai'undi
owner's lineage married into Andiriha and were given the Inonda
[428] land to "look after." As is usual among Orokaiva, this right to

A [See Cat. 116, p. End Map 8—Analyst]

625 excursions. This was, however, an experience of short duration and,
731 once back in Sivepe, the village constable reverted to his former role, as described above. In 1956, all village constables handed back to the government their handcuffs, the symbol of their authority, and the Local Government Councils took over.

With regard to interpersonal relations, the evacuation set up
[685] a mutual distrust due to the removal of certain social controls.
[571] Theft is comparatively uncommon in Orokaiva villages, but this is because property is extremely well-guarded and everyone in the village is constantly under observation by other villagers. The idea of villages being left unguarded was repugnant to Orokaiva, and fear of prowling had to be countered by strict control on the part of village constables over anyone entering the restricted area. I could find no evidence of a change in interpersonal relations beyond the period of evacuation.

476 The Orokaiva are not often observed to work in groups; from
571 the relatively acephalous structure it may already be inferred that they do not have regular work leaders controlling groups. Most gardening is done by each extended family separately; house building is done by the prospective occupants with the help of some individuals who feel an obligation, mostly a brother or brother-in-law. Even at feasts, there is a minimum of truly communal labour: the food is supplied by individuals who deliver it to the display platform and it is only the dancing, the ceremonial and a few minor construction tasks that may be communal. There are in Sivepe two yam gardens where work is communal; these are in sharp contrast to all other garden work. Yet people readily gather for common efforts which have a festive and ceremonial nature or enterprises which arouse an episodic enthusiasm. Examples are the communal fishing and hunting expeditions, projects such as the mission hospital or the marking of the ward boundary.

Even during these communal episodes, the tendency is for each small group to perform a certain task separately, though contemporaneously. A hunting party splits up into family groups who do not meet again until the hunt is over. In fishing each group has its own spot. Similarly in the building of new Sivepe, there was little that was overtly communal, as each small group was working on a house for themselves or a close kinsman. Nonetheless, one would be wrong to
[342] describe this pattern as Individualistic. After all, every house was
[177] in the same style and of the same size--and this was not wholly a "traditional" style; it was a style introducing new materials and an increase in size of about 50%. When such a change is made by everybody who builds a new house, this indicates that the group is strongly bound by collective decisions.

177 Unwittingly, the Australian government has tended to make the
654 Orokaiva more oriented towards group work than he was before. Road
571 work, the compulsory planting of rubber trees, compulsory resettlement in larger villages--all these added to the volume of group work while the volume of individual work remained constant within the villages.

not care to do with the mission quite so close. On this occasion the village looked more harmonious than I saw it at other times; the pagan half was fully able to join in.

The main difference in leadership--the premise of equality in Sivepe, the "big man" complex (see Sahlins, 1963, etc.) in Inonda--is probably attributable to an organisational difference between the mountain and coastal villages. In all my contacts with coastal people I have noticed the same posture of the "big man" among the persons of high rank. In the Sasembata district, however, it is not so easily tolerated if a man tries to stand above his fellows. There was a talented entrepreneur in Hamburata village, but this man was more interested in heading a cooperative than in purely private or family aggrandisement. There are, however, cooperatives on the coast also, and the case of Inonda may not be a typical one.

Section 4: Marginal Individuals

In this section the attempt at comparing the two villages broke down. This was because Inonda had as far as I know only one outstandingly marginal individual and shortly after I arrived they put him in jail. He had broken into a store with a hammer belonging to another villager; the other villager was apprehended by the police and successfully proved he had been framed.

In Sivepe, there were several marginal individuals some of whom became key personalities, I think, mainly because of our presence. Both our interpreters fell into that category. One of them was an unmarried mother and therefore already marginal. She was also extremely intelligent, knew English rather well, was the secretary of the woman's club. Her position was weakened because her father and mother were both dead; the father of her child came from her father's village; she therefore had been sent to her mother's village. Here she reached prominence in the affairs of the women's club and as our interpreter (she always translated holding or feeding the baby, but most reliably) but her position in her mother's brother's house was a delicate one and she had to leave her mother's father's house where she lived earlier. Although she was attractive, and only 22 years of age, her chances of marriage were thought extremely dim. She exploited to the full the chances of power provided by her association with us, especially in the earlier period when I understood no Orokaiva at all.

The other interpreter, also about 22, was Robert's younger brother. While Patricia, the women's club secretary, was extremely gregarious and adept at handling people, Leon, with a Standard 6 education, and the leading male expert in the English language and other school knowledge, was unusually shy. He was hardly ever seen talking spontaneously to any of the married men. He heartily disliked the interview situation and other duties that would draw him into the public. This tendency